at the End of the Twentieth Century deals with the question as to whether the institutional church can survive. It is 3.95 in hardcover. *Death in the City* exposes the nature of our world and tells how the church must change if it meets the challenge of our times. 1.95 in paperback.

C. S. Lewis' *God in the Dock* is a book of his essays on religion and ethics, published posthumously. These are short, pithy statements on a great variety of topics, but always in the usual Lewis style and depth. The title is taken from Lewis' notion that in our day it is man that thinks of himself on the judgement seat and it is God in the dock being judged. He believes, by the way, that the best way to approach modern man about his sins is not to speak of drunkeness or fornication, for today's man is not drunk and with modern contraceptives does not feel guilty of fornication. We should rather speak of pride, conceit, jealousy, and cowardice. It is high at 6.95, but it is a big book, beautifully bound.

For 4.95 we'll send you a 600-page book on philosophy, one that I use in college. It makes for an ideal introduction to the basic issues in philosophy, exciting and non-technical, entitled *Philosophy for a New Generation.*

Pat Boone's *A New Song* is a big seller across the nation. Even from our little office we have moved upwards of 100 copies. We have a few more at 4.95.

The New Humanity is the title of our new 1970 volume of this journal, with hard cover, dust jacket, introduction and table of contents. All the issues for 1970 in handsome, durable binding for only 3.00. Order now and we'll bill you when we send the book sometime this spring.

Our journal is growing, with scores of new readers added to our list each month. We hope to add 1,000 new names before the year is out, and we are asking our readers to help us. Many become subscribers because someone is kind enough to send them a sample copy. These are the kind of readers we want, people who are willing to think and share ideas.

For only 3.00 you can send this journal to six different people, and we do the mailing from our office. Or for only 1.00 a month (10.00 a year) we will send you a bundle of ten copies each month, which you can send along to your friends as you have opportunity. One or both of these ways will help us add 1,000 new names. Will you help us?

When yon renew we urge you do so for *two* years (2.00) and thus save us both renewal effort. We have many exciting articles coming up, such as one in the next issue on *A Visit with Pat and Shirley Boone* and Ervin Waters' personal testimony in *The Odessey of Division.* Help us share this good stuff with others.

RESTORATION REVIEW, 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas 76201.

RESTORATION REVIEW

The Restoration Mind . . .

REFORMATION IS RESTORATION

It was not mere happenstance that Alexander Campbell used the terms *reformation* and *restoration* interchangeably. Nor was it only accidental that the followers of the Campbell movement of a century ago were hailed by their neighbors as *reformers.* Our pioneers saw their labors as a reformation effort, part and parcel of the work begun by Martin Luther. It was a matter of taking up where Luther left off.

The restoration mind is the reformation mind, and *vice versa,* for to restore man to God is to reform both his life and his religious institutions. In this series we have defined restoration as a return to the original character and purpose of the creator, whether we speak of a painting, a car, or of man. This involves reformation, which we may define as a fundamental change or transformation. And we are talking about *individual* lives, for reformation and restoration are realized only on that basis. Institutions are not transformed as such, but only as individuals who make up that institution are changed. Men are restored to God, recreated into the image that God intended, through a reformation of their lives.

This has all along been the cry of God's prophets. "Cease to do evil and learn to do right, was Isaiah's reformation theme, while "Come back to me, apostate children" was the cry of Jeremiah. "Come, let us return to the Lord" was the plea of Hosea, while Amos could speak of the restoration of David's fallen house. John the Baptist came with a message of repentance, insisting that the kingdom of heaven has to do with transformed lives. Jesus also proclaimed "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand." They all related the idea of a restoration of the fortunes of Isreal to the concept of the transformation of individual lives.

The *reformed* person is one who has been renewed by the Spirit of God, and he is therefore *restored* to God. If a restoration movement has any notion other than restoring man to God, it is all amiss. But the restorationist believes that changed lives means a transformation of those institutions through which man expresses his devotion to God, the home and the church in particular. We should oppose any restoration effort that ignores the authenticity of the church or its ordinances.

Among our own Churches of Christ, where there is praiseworthy concern for the recovery of the significance of the individual, there is the danger that

Volume 13, No. 2 **February, 1971**

the concept of the church as the body of Christ will lose much of its historic and scriptural meaning. The church at large has been through this experience again and again. Liberalism was once willing to see the church as little more than a sociological phenomenon, being as averse to anything supernatural as it was. Fundamentalism moved to the other extreme, conceiving the church as everything from "Christian fellowships" to "gospel halls," and largely ignoring the great historic institutions that have made the church the body of Christ. Liberalism neglected to see the church as the body of *Christ,* while Fundamentalism failed to appreciate the church as the *Body* of Christ.

It is this that alarms me about our own "house church" movement, however much I appreciate the concerns that motivate it. The "Spirit movement" which often goes with it is equally alarming. Such efforts can actually obstruct restoration and reformation in that they encourage a disengagement from the very institutions that so badly need transformation. It is the same fallacy committed by those physicans who want to reform medical practices, but who in their enthusiasm divorce themselves from the American Medical Association and the general hospitals and go out and do their thing in separate clinics. *Reformations take place from within.* House churches are fine so long as they are supplementary to institutional activities, for in this way they constitute a friendly underground that can bring about the right kind of influence for change in the *status quo.*

But house churches too often displace the organized body of Christ, with its adherents almost completely separated from their home congregations. It tends to ignore the place that God has given to organization in the congregation, and "housekeeping for the Lord" is largely a matter of the whim of the one who starts the house church. It is therefore something less than the body of Christ in assembly, and it is not likely to help in the reformation of the established church.

This is a *conservative* view toward the established forms of religion. It is to say that regardless of how ineffective and irrelevant the church of today may be in its institutional forms, it is nevertheless the body of Christ. Its long history and its institutions, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, have meaning, and we should value what truths are preserved in its forms. And we should begin in our congregations, not away from them, the work of reformation that will restore God's people to his original intention for the body of Christ. If mini-meetings and house churches remain within the context of the body of Christ in any given locality, and do not usurp the functions of that body, such as serving the Supper (which I see as a *corporate* act of saints in assembly), then they can be a blessing to the restoration-reformation movement. This is why in my own mini-meetings, which have the aura

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.

of the underground, I always respect the integrity of the local assembly. Whether or not I am called on to take any part or however bad I may think the situation is, I make it a point to be present and join in the services. I would be the first to object to any move to make a mini-meeting a "mini-church" that would assume the corporate function of the body of Christ.

The body of Christ is not only a fellowship of believers, but also a social institution within a culture, organized by heaven's edict, with its elders and deacons, and equipped both to edify and discipline its members. And such an institution is in constant need of renewal and reformation, and it *can* be renewed, however long it may take. It is not a question of whether the church is completely restored to God's original intention for it, for that probably never occurs. What is important is that it is a *reforming* church, growing toward what it ought to be, changing and being renewed.

The restoration mind is therefore a conservative mind, honoring the contributions of history and preserving the ground fought for and won. But it is also a patient mind, realizing that the most valued things in life do not come quickly or easily. It learns to be thankful for minor victories and slight changes for the better. It seeks the warmth of a slow-burning back log rather than the intense heat of a brush fire that soon burns out, leaving one cold and disappointed. It is satisfied with conversion, and does not demand over-conversion.

The restorationist rejoices in the person and work of the Holy Spirit, but he does not suppose that the Spirit was born yesterday. He has been at work in the body of Christ all these years, however stifled his efforts. He has never slumbered or slept nor taken vacations. He claims his victories in his own way, and he gets his work done, though not always as sensationally as we might expect.

The restorationist is a reformer in that he believes that men and institutions *can* be changed. He is not a mere critic or a calamity howler. He moves to the inside and works for change from within, for he believes in what already exists. He simply wants to change what is wrong and restore what is lacking. He doesn't leave, for he realizes that the changes that really matter are those wrought by those who care enough to stay, those content with bit-by-bit victories.

Such was the attitude of Jesus in the letter to Sardis. The letter was addressed "To the angel of *the church at Sardis.*" It *was* indeed the body of Christ at Sardis, not splintered into a bunch of "loyal churches." The picture was not good, to be sure, for the letter was a command to repent. But neither was it all bad. Reference is made to "what is left," and there were *some* who walked with Jesus in white. Jesus was working for reform from within. He did not tell the faithful ones to leave and start a *loyal* congregation. They rather found themselves in a church that was so well nigh dead that the Lord wrote to them urging that they "Wake up!" Jesus was not satisfied with anything they were doing. But some were faithful to him. He was willing to start there, and not *out* of there. The Holy Spirit never instructs any saint to leave the body of Christ

where he is a member. He rather teaches that "they who separate themselves are sensual."

We make good reformers and restorers when we learn the simple lesson that once we place ourselves at God's disposal, he can use us gloriously, if not sensationally, wherever we are. But it will be in *his* way, not our way. That may also be simple, buc it is a lesson man is slow to learn. — *the Editor*

AN OPEN LETTER TO A REJECTED MINISTER

So as to conceal identity for the time being I will not quote directly from the letter received from a young Texas minister, but will only explain the circumstance that motivated the following letter. The minister, engaged in work among young people rejected by society, has been required by his elders to denounce Pat Boone publicly, and to assert that he does not believe in the "miraculous" work of the Holy Spirit today, and that he believes that any such teaching is of the devil. Unable by his own conscience to make such a declaration, he has submitted his resignation. His support in now threatened, as well as his ministry to deprived youth.—*the Editor*

My dear young brother in the Lord:

I am of course terribly grieved about the events described in your most recent letter. I feel a deep compassion for your elders who have taken such drastic action, for it is they, not yourself, that is the real tragedy of this story. You will in some way be able to continue in your dedicated task, laboring for Jesus as a free man, while they will be confined to their little world that continues to schrivel, mistaking loyalty to dogma for loyalty to the Christ. I pity them for their bondage and my heart yearns for them to know the liberty that is in Christ Jesus.

When events like this occur, in which sincere brethren get caught in a whirpool of conflicts, I ask myself why men behave the way they do. All those involved are of honest and good hearts. They love Jesus and want to do what is right and honorable. Your elders would not want to hurt anyone's feelings, and they are no doubt men who believe in justice and fair play. They want to follow the Bible in all they do. And yet here they are imposing themselves upon the conscience of a young brother in direct violation of the scriptural injunction for individual freedom. Moreover, in order to preserve the *status quo* they demand that one brother publicly denounce another brother. My reply to this is that of Paul's: "And you, sir, why do you hold your brother in contempt? (Ro. 14: 10) Yes, indeed, *why* is the big question.

Sometimes men are *institutionally* motivated. What *one* brother would never think of doing on his own, because of his own sense of decency, a group of men serving as an eldership or as administration will do, as if they lost their individual identity in the impersonal character of the institution they represent. Remember that it was *devout* people, church folk, that sent Jesus to the cross. But each one who shared in it might have behaved differently had it been only himself involved with Jesus. Your elders fell prey to the evil notion that man is made for the sabbath rather than the other way around, or that the church member is made for doctrine, and not doctrine for the member, if we put it in more modern terms. Just as it was religion that killed Jesus it was Church of Christism that rejected you.

The Jewish hierarchy had its system to protect, so it did not matter how much good our Lord was doing. They hounded him even when he was ministering to the afflicted, even when he was doing what they wouldn't do. But he had to go since they saw him as a threat to that which they served as guardians. As free men in Christ your elders would have made the well being of souls their primary consideration, and so they would have measured well the work you are doing among the lost generation. They would have also been sensitive to the feelings of Pat Boone, who is a brother for whom Christ died. They would have considered what this might do to you personally, whether it might discourage you and turn you back to the world and its allurements. And they would have thought of our youth and the effect that such action would have had upon them.

Yes, if they were *free,* they would have so behaved. Only free people can weigh alternatives. Only free people can give men and events time. It is the unfree that must hurry and do their thing. The trial of Jesus could not even wait till morning. It was Luther, one who had broken the bond of institutionalism, that could speak so wisely as *Give men time!*

"And you, sir, why do you pass judgement on your brother?" The answer to the apostle's question may sometimes be that men are frightened. They fear the unfamiliar. They fear change. They fear what *might* happen, what *might* come next if they yield any ground at all. And fearful people are dangerous, whether it be a gun they wear or authority they bear. While it sounds ridiculous that anyone would be afraid of our dear brother Pat Boone, or of our dear comforter the Holy Spirit, that is about the size of it. Poor Pat. When the brethren kept him busy flying all over the country for youth rallies, fund-raising, and advertising campaigns for the Church of Christ, nobody was afraid of him. According to his own testimony he was at that time flirting with movie actresses at cocktail parties, fouling up his marriage, and sleeping through church with liquor on his breath.He says he was a hypocrite back then. And we might reasonably have fear of hypocrites and their influence. But Pat was always in his place on Sunday morning at the Church of Christ wherever he was, and he was doctrinally pure, having no brief for the Holy Spirit and all that stuff. So nobody was afraid of him. He was a good guy, a friend of our leading ministers and one who was on first-name basis with college presidents and professors.

Now he is written up in our press as an heretic, excommunicated by his brethren as fallen from grace, and even those, like yourself, who dare to turn a sympathetic ear in his direction, are compelled to renounce him publicly. Even if we treated dogs and cats the way we have treated Pat Boone it would be proper that we be reprimanded by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

And is it not sad that our folk are frightened of the Holy Spirit? So scared are they that he might do something "special" or "miraculous" in our age that they actually demand that a young minister get up publicly and assert that the Spirit certainly will not do anything of the sort!

I see yet a third reason why men do such things as your elders have done

to you, besides fear and institutionalization, and that is ignorance. An explanation that also applies to the rejection of our Lord, as do the other two reasons. Recall Peter's declaration in Acts 2:17 to those who had murdered Jesus: "I know quite well that you acted in ignorance." It is one of the sins that crucified Christ. I say sin because it was surely a *willful* ignorance. We cannot always make that kind of judgement of our brethren's ignorance, whether willful or unwillful, but it is certain that ignorance is a large part of the problem.

In the case of your elders it is an ignorance of both facts and personalities. Pat Boone shows no signs of wanting to lead the church into some weird apostasy, nor is he out to try to get everyone to speak in tongues. He makes it clear that it is the *Giver* that he wants to bear witness to, not any gift as such. The chances are that if your elders could have Pat in their homes over a weekend that they would be both impressed and edified by his newly-found spiritual life. They would be pleased with the influence he would have on their children, and they might even find themselves wanting his simple trusting faith, however "doctrinally pure" it may or may not be. This is to say that they do not know the man that they want you to publicly denounce. Surely Pat would pray, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

It is also an ignorance of the very Bible that they profess to respect. A careful reading of the verses that teach about the Holy Spirit would make them reluctant to make such sweeping judgements on those who have a vital and meaningful relationship with the heavenly Guest. The old Church of Christ fallacy (no one else believes such a thing!) that the Spirit operates only through the Word and that you have the Spirit to the extent that you know the Bible simply with not hold up in the light of what the Bible itself says about the work of the Spirit.

For instance, Ro. 8:14 says "All who are moved (or led) by the Spirit of God are sons of God." Are we to conclude that the Spirit's work of moving or leading us is dependent upon how much Bible we know? Those to whom Paul was writing did not have what we call the Bible. They were led by the Spirit because the Spirit was in them! So he says in Ro. 8:9: "If a man does not possess the Spirit of Christ, he is no Christian." The same chapter talks about the Spirit coming to the aid of our weakness, pleading for us before God, and elsewhere it is said that our very bodies become a shrine for his indwelling. Call that "miraculous" if you will.

I have said all this because of the discipline of understanding. To understand why men act the way they do goes far in solving the problem insofar as we are personally concerned. When men are moved by mass thinking (or *unthinking*), fear and ignorance, they need our pity more than our censure. Once we understand we can better love them and pray for them. As it is now they are the tragedy, they are the losers. And we don't want them to be losers, but to become victors in Christ by becoming free men instead of party men.

The most impressive part of this story is that you took your stand for freedom, decency and integrity. You could not see yourself up denouncing Pat Boone, even if you did not agree with him in all his recent conclusions. You stood for the freedom of the conscience, the very principle that made the Restoration Movement a vital force in our culture. You could have rationalized and found a reason for "passing judgement on your brother" and thus kept your job. You would have had money, a mess of pottage; but now you have your integrity. Congratulations! I thank God for you. And you can be assured that the vast rank and file of our people would admire you for the stand you have taken. It is a victory that only free men can enjoy and that only they can understand. The party man may hate you, but for the same reason our Lord was hated. When you are the Lord's and not the party's it makes a big difference. And there is absolutely no question but what the Lord will bless you and lead you in the way that shines brighter than you could have ever imagined. He is able to do abundantly more than we can either ask or imagine. To trust in him is your victory. He has never let anybody down yet, and he will bear you up, believe me, as if on eagles' wings. You need not fear what any man or party can do. They may fire you and try to starve you out. They may reject you. But the same Lord that fed Elijah with ravens will watch over you and preserve you.

"If we live, we live for the Lord; and if we die, we die for the Lord. Whether therefore we live or die, we belong to the Lord" (Ro. 14:8).

Those who "belong" to the party have the party to look to for their well being. Those who "belong" to the Lord have him to look to for their sustenance.

God bless you for taking your stand and making it clear to whom you belong. It is indeed your greatest hour, an hour that will take its flight into eternity itself.

And you are *my* folk, my Church of Christ folk. Your stand for Jesus rather than party is one more testimonial to the glorious fact that we are changing for the better. And one more reason why I'm not leaving!

Fathfully yours,
Leroy Garrett

IS AMBITION A CHRISTIAN VIRTUE?

We do well to remind ourselves that those qualities in man that are highly esteemed by the world are not necessarily the graces of the Christian. The Christian virtues are explicitly listed in the scriptures, and they are clearly described as the fruit of the Spirit, including such things as love, peace, joy, kindness and gentleness. Knowledge makes at least one list, self-control at least two, while forbearance, patience, compassion and forgiveness appear frequently.

These virtues may be respected by the world, but they are not the virtues really esteemed by and sought after by the world. The virtues displayed on the athletic field are far more popular: aggressiveness, competition, strength, success, skill. One hardly associates compassion and gentleness with sports, and sports best represent the spirit of our culture, somewhat like gladiatorial combat in the Roman Colosseum represented that culture.

Some of the philosophers call for a "transvaluation" of the Christian virtues on the ground that they are not appropriate to our kind of world. Nietzsche looked to "the will to power" as man's greatest virtue, despising the Christian graces that only justify men in their weakness, as he saw it. Thomas Hobbes saw brutal competition as the hope for civilized man. Aristotle, long before Christ,

spoke of "the magnanimous man" as the one of virtue, the description of which would fit that of an intellectual snob as well.

The virtues esteemed by the Greeks and Romans are not necessarily Christian, especially when viewed as they viewed them, the effect of man's ingenuity and pride: *justice, temperance, courage,* and *wisdom.* Truth and beauty were also esteemed, but these too were humanistically conceived, more the work of man than God.

Since our culture has for so long honored ambition as a noble virtue, it is well to ask ourselves into what category it would fall, whether more characteristic of Aristotle's magnanimous man or Paul's spiritual man. Is it to be placed alongside cleverness and aggressiveness or with humility and compassion?

As one scans the history of man in search of those who excelled in ambition he thinks of the pharaohs and ceasars of ancient empires. Shakespeare has Cassius turning on Julius Ceasar because he was "an ambitious man." There is Napoleon, Cromwell, and Hitler, whose ambitions changed the course of history. Turning to the Bible we notice a difference between Saul and David in this regard. It is noteworthy that the latter returned to tending sheep after being anointed king of Israel. And it may well be that the main difference between Judas and Peter was in terms of ambition. The mother of the sons of Zebedee, who wanted her sons seated next to the Messiah in the coming kingdom, and the sick woman who sought Jesus through the crowds in hope of touching him, were both highly motivated women; but we would attribute ambition more to the former than to the latter.

And yet ambition, like industry and integrity, is highly valued by nearly all of us. We urge it upon our children and we impress it upon our students, for we suppose that an unambitious man will come to nought. We follow the thinking of Edward Young when he insisted that "Too low they build who build below the skies." To be successful, to get ahead, this is the order of the day.

The Christian's response to the question of ambition depends on just what is meant by ambition. It is all right to be a general, or rich, or even popular; but it may be something different to *desire* to be a general, or rich, or popular. And if he desires it, *why* does he desire it?. A Christian may not only be rich, but he may even desire it, if for the right reasons. This kind of thinking will take us to the heart of the question of whether we are to be ambitious.

If one wishes to be a general because he believes he has a plan for winning the war and thus bring an end to hostilities, it is the right kind of ambition. But if he aspires such leadership so that he can get ahead of the other fellow and in enjoy the glory of publicity, it is the wrong kind of ambition. When John F. Kennedy was aspiring to the presidency, he was asked by his father why he wanted to be president. He replied, "Because it is the ultimate in public service." If any man who becomes president *really* enters the office with that attitude, we could hardly call him "an ambitious man" after the order of Julius Ceasar.

To be ambitious usually means that one desires to be more successful, more conspicuous than someone else. Institutions are notorously this way, for they survive by being aggressive, which often takes the form of "throat-cutting" competition. The individual will also be caught up in his kind of attitude if he is not controlled by the disciple of God. While ambition may not be listed as a work of the flesh, a host of its cousins are listed: *rivalry, jealousy, strife, envy, contention, quarreling.* It is noteworthy that the *New English Bible* translates "strife" in Gal. 5:20 as *selfish ambitions,* which identifies the ambition that we are speaking of and makes it a work of the flesh.

We need take a hard look at ourselves and some of our practices in reference to selfish ambitions. Whether it be an extensive subscription list for a periodical, a multi-million dollar edifice for an assembly of the saints, the social standing of those who serve as elders, or the prestige of the pulpit that one occupies, there is a real hazard that we have the wrong kind of ambition. Our *system* inclines us toward selfish ambition, causing us to confuse our values and shift our priorities. The young minister is taught by example, if not be precept, to compete for the better jobs with the larger churches. Congregations vie even with their own kind for preeminence in the brotherhood. *Success* has become a banal thing things esteemed by men.
these days, measured as it is by the

Billy Graham once commented, when someone was praising his labors, that it may well be that some obscure preacher on skid-row ministering to drunks may be doing a work more highly esteemed in the eyes of God than his own. We spoke above of the humility of David, who returned to his work of caring for sheep even after being anointed king by the great Samuel. It was quite a lesson for Samuel to learn, and for us all, when all those stalwart sons of Jesse passed before him and God chose none of them. Most of us, no doubt, would have selected one of those mighty youths. It was the inconsequential shepherd boy that wasn't even being considered that God chose! Just as God's foolishness puts to naught our wisdom, to use Paul's language, so does God's wisdom make foolish our ambitions. I have no way of knowing that God is pleased with those things that seem to concern us most.

If the ambition that puts means before ends (and systems before personalities) is indeed a work of the flesh, then it is also a source of destruction. Shakespeare caught this important truth in his great tragedies. Caesar stood at the threshold of a new kind of Rome, one that would be ruled by law rather than by men. He would have been a great blessing to his people if he could have resisted the temptation to project himself rather than principle. Assassination resulted. So with Macbeth who lacked the discipline of those wise restraints that lead man to place reason above emotion. He was driven by a mad ambition to be king, and so murder beget murder. He speaks for many a man when he wailed "I have no spur to prick the sides of my intent, but only vaulting ambition, which overleaps itself and falls on the other."

It is not so with the disciple of Jesus who by the Spirit has put to death the works of the flesh, and thus, walks even as *He* walked. The Lord has given us an example that we are to walk in his steps, and this can never be the way of ambitious pride. Moreover the man who follows Jesus, unlike the carnal Macbeth who had only evil prophecies and a foolish wife to prod him on in his madness, has the disciplines of the Holy Spirit "to prick the sides of his intent."

"If by the Spirit you put to death all the base pursuits of the body, then you will live" (Ro.8:13)—*the Editor*

TRUE FREEDOM VS. FALSE CREEDS

HOWARD SAWYER

One who is truly free is not a free-lancer, for freedom does not mean license. But it does mean that I am at liberty to enjoy fellowship with Christians with whom I do not agree on every point. Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free, and if the Son shall make you free, then you are free indeed." To some brethren this means that one is free to believe only what *we* believe and enjoy fellowship only with those that we recognize.

Our freedom is being jeopardized by our own creeds, creeds that are in our hearts and mind if not written in a book. The ones who howl "We have no creed" are the very ones who are ready to label you as *unsound* if you do not subscribe to their way of thinking.

I don't believe in drawing party lines or in quarantining those who stray from orthodoxy. I have rebelled at putting a strangle-hold on those who dare to be different. Gal. 5:1 says: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ made us free, and be not entangled again the yoke of bondage." This gift of liberty some brethren would take from us, and what Christ freed us from some would bind upon our necks.

The practice of making laws where God has made none and drawing lines of fellowship that God has not drawn finds it roots in pharisaism. The "holier than thou" attitude is defeating to the liberty that is in Christ. Jesus and Paul would not fit into the circles that men draw around themselves, for they were free of the sectarian spirit. Jesus and Paul were not concerned about those things that men divide over these days.

A plea for Christian freedom is not a call for believing any and every thing. It does not mean that we are to endorse every idea that is promulgated. It is rather an affirmation that we can differ without dividing. We differ on on how to care for orphans, participation in the military, and even on the question of future punishment and reward. Then there is the premillennial point of view. Can we not differ in these areas without dividing? Must there be the drawing of lines on those who sincerely hold a different position?

Those who tell me that I cannot enjoy fellowship with a brother who believes in the premillennial coming of the Lord deny me of the freedom that is in Christ. Or if one tells me I can't believe such a doctrine without being an apostate and headed for that place too horrible to mention he too denies me of the liberty to be my own man in Christ.

If we can differ on the war question or questions about the degrees of rewards and punishments without line drawing, why can we not also on the millennium question? I believe my freedom in Christ allows me to receive those who are premillennial as well as those who are amillennial.—*Minister, Highland Park Church of Christ,* 1614 *Kirby, Chattanooga* 37404.

FAIR PLAY

W. NEIL GALLAGHER

I voice nothing new in this essay, only something freshly made apparent. In my few years as a member of the contemporary church of Christ, I have been deeply moved by the attitudes and acts of its members: I have been impressed by the respect for Scripture, lifted by the kindness and generosity, strengthened by the spiritual vigor, encouraged by the academic excellence, galvanized by the displays of sacrifice, and discouraged by the lack of fair play.

It seems that, on occasion, we current members of the church of Christ-in our well-intentioned drives to be keepers of orthodoxy—itch with the temptation to be unquestionably defensive, readily suspicious, or impulsively condemnatory of those brethren to the right or left of us. Each of us seems to tacitly believe that he stands in and stands for the balanced and true middle position, each seems to possess the proper mixture of liberalism and conservatism. From my particular pontifical position - perched squarely and infallibly in the middle — I find my pride teased and my energies excited to lash the incorrigible brethren to the right of me as "backward," "narrow - minded," "hard - hearted," and "legalistic," and those who reprehensibly stand to the left of me as "arrogant," "libertine," "social gospelers," and "intellectual snobs." I find that as current defender of the faith for the Ft. Worth-Dallas area, I naturally and sincerely have to personally pass on, publish, or preach my estimates on the brother in question. I feel earnestly compelled to keep the doctrinal dossier in order. The problem is, however, that my sense of mission is so burning, my sincerity so captivating, my motives so unvarnished, and my anxiety so uncomfortable that I sometimes fail to check out the facts. Exit fair play.

Henceforth, I publish or preach about the brother, institution, or church which scored poorly on my cursory but sure-fire tests for orthodoxy. If the public disclosure proves to be accurate, it will probably never become apparent that I did not check out the facts. If the rumors and hearsay I picked up and passed on later prove to be grounded in fact, it will probably never become apparent that I dodged the New Testament way of approaching my brother-to wit, eye-to-eye and heart-to-heart. If my thin guess later proves to be correct, it is conceivable that in spite of my discoureteous methods and unverified information I may have even done the brotherhood a service by exposing someone who needs help and correction.

But if I'm wrong . . . if I'm wrong, what does fair play require then? How do you re-establish the solid reputation of a brother, institution, or church you've demeaned? How do you restore the truth about one whom you've publicly and persuasively maligned? Just how do you get the brotherhood to trust him (or them) again?—*Minister, Maypearl Church of Christ, Box* 275, *Maypearl, Texas* 76064, *and graduate student at Texas Christian University.*

READERS' EXCHANGE

A Noble Example

This is a beautiful story I am about to tell you, one mingled with both tragedy and triumph. It is beautiful because it concerns a beautiful soul, the late Bob Haddow of Temple City, California. Ours was a correspondence friendship, for it was never my pleasure to know him face to face. God will grant even that after awhile. Bob was an ardent supporter of this journal and the cause it has espoused. He wrote often, sending in names, making suggestions, or passing along tidbits. My image of him (we always do that of our unseen friends, don't we?) was of a man in a big hurry to get something done for the brotherhood and the world before the time runs out. I could see him bouncing about the place and attending to several irons in the fire at the same time.

What a shock it was for me to learn that Bob Haddow had been an invalid flat on his back in bed for the last 22 years. His letters spoke of the Christ, the church, the unity of the saints, but never a word that he was writing under such dire circumstances. His mother, Ecile Haddow, told me Bob's story in a recent letter, and she has given her consent to my repeating it here.

Bob had a severe case of polio back in 1949 when he was 21 years old. He was confined to an iron lung for several months and finally improved enough to breathe on his own, but his vital energies were greatly depleted. His parents moved him from Washington to California in a house trailer, the only way he could be moved, hoping that the new environment would speed his rehabilitation. While he improved considerably he was able to move only his left hand, but could not lift even it.

Despite these handicaps Bob Haddow was not only able to negotiate his own life but also to make an important contribution to the cause he loved so deeply, the realization of Jesus' prayer for the oneness of his people. By use of a sling to hold his arm he was able to wash his face, shave himself and feed himself. His father designed a special table over his lap so that he could type out with one hand those letters that he sent throughout the country. The last such letter I received from Bob concerned Pat Boone. He expressed hope that the opposition to Pat would not discourage him. I passed the letter along to Pat, explaining who Bob Haddow was.

Though a member of the Temple City Church of Christ, Bob's concern for unity carried his spirit far beyond party lines. He and his parents were in touch with nearby Rosemead Church of Christ (Christian) and carried on their own ecumenical movement.

His funeral was itself a testimony to his heart's desire, for it was conducted by men representing different wings of our fractured brotherhood, though held at the Church of Christ.

The bulletin of the Christian Church referred to above contained the following statements in tribute to Bob Haddow:

The one thing for which Bob will be remembered, from our personal point of view, was his undying passion for the unity of brethren of churches of Christ who hold different views in respect to certain areas of doctrine or practice of worship. Probably no one will have done more, both locally and over a wide area to begin to bring about the desire and expectancy of unity amongst local congregations of the faith.

With a kindliness of spirit and humility of mind, coupled with the deepest compassion for the people of God, Bob lost no opportunity to challenge the brotherhood to seek the "unity of the faith" that must one day result in the "unity of the body."

Bob loved the Holy Scriptures and was so familiar with them that his relationship of them to the Christian's daily practice was a delight to all who shared these truths with nim. He was alert to separate truth from error in the use of the Scriptures, and helped many a preacher to become better acquainted with his message in the application of God's word.

Bob's life was a powerful sermon itself in accepting the changing misfortunes of life and still permitting God to radiate through him in obedience and in pattern. No one could know him without being far the richer for the true fellowship he offered and the depth of gratitude he bestowed. The brotherhood will be far poorer because of his going, but far richer in the heritage of faith, his great bequest to us.

YOU CAN HELP

Letters like this are rather common, coming from folk who are delighted to have found out about *Restoration Review*. I hear the same thing in my travels: "I don't know who sent me your paper," they'll say, "but I'm pleased to have found out about it." This is something that *you* can do to help our cause along: send in a list of names of folk, young and old, whom you believe would be interested in what we are saying. Unless it is through you they may never know about some of these ideas. We make it easy for you financially, for at only 50 cents per name, in clubs of 6 or more, you can send this paper for a whole year. Or we'll send you a bundle so that you can mail them out in your own correspondence at only 10 cents each, if you tell us that is your purpose.

What Readers are Saying

We have recently been put on your subscription list, and we are more than grateful to our brother who did this for us! Where have you been all these years? Or more correctly where have we been? How we thank and praise God for the freedom we now know in Christ Jesus as we came to a knowledge of His indwelling Spirit and realized we didn't have to "do it ourselves" after all. After three years of painful growth, the Lord has answered our Elijah prayers in many ways — one was the dear brother who put us on your list! — *Tennessee*

May the Lord help you in trying to point out the true and living way more perfectly. How sorely it is needed, and how humble and wise must be the leader. Always keep in mind Gal. 6:1. I will be 80 on May 30th. Awaiting the coming of Christ. — *Florida*

It is too bad that more of our churches don't hand out such fine spiritual reading to its members, instead of worrying themselves with the beauty of church buildings. — *North Carolina*

I face what many preachers face today — a sincere desire to re-establish New Testament Christianity and to seek what the Bible really says while the church I was raised in and love find itself tradition bound and unwilling really to study the Bible to see what it says because of our traditions. One of the elders here made this clear when he said during a lectureship on the Spirit: "This is what the Church of Christ teaches," not *This is what the Bible teaches.* — *Ohio*

When I first began to read *Restoration Review* and *Mission Messenger* and other such papers, I got discouraged, but I have been encouraged lately by the many brothers with whom I have talked who are beginning to see what the gospel really is. — *Texas*

Spirit Is Moving

The following verse was written and put to music by a brother associated with our one-cup folk. When Ervin Waters was in my home recently he played this piece to us from his tape recorder. It was accompanied by guitar. I was so impressed by it that I wrote the brother for a copy and

asked him if I could pass it along to my readers.

A mighty force is moving all across the land,
It's bigger than this whole wide universe, brother,
Yet it's small enough to fit in the heart of man.
It's moving, moving, feel it moving today,
The Spirit is moving, you better be ready,
Brother, it's passing your way.
It's moving on your waters, it's moving on your land;
It's writing on the hearts of your sons and your daughters,
And you'll have to feel it brother if you understand.
It's moving, moving, feel it moving today.
The Spirit is moving, you better be ready,
Brother, it's passing your way.
It's writing down a message sent from God above,
Telling us to turn from the ways of war,
And start our feet to walking in the path of love.
It's moving, moving, feel it moving today.
The Spirit is moving, you better be ready,
Brother, it's passing your way.
It's giving us the faith now to know it's not too late;
We can open doors that we never could before,
And with it, brother, we can move a mountain of hate.
It's moving, moving, feel it moving today.
The Spirit is moving, you better be ready,
Brother, it's passing your way.
Maranatha, sing *Maranatha.*

To hear it sung would be better, but a study of the above gives us an insight into what disturbs our youth, our guitar-playing youth. That this kind of awareness of the Spirit, put to song, comes out of the Church of Christ, and the far right wing at that, is really something. We'd better get with it or we may be left out, whatever wing we're riding! This brother wrote me, after receiving his first copies of this journal, that he wanted to know more about Pat Boone's experiences. He hadn't heard about it, he explained, being affiliated with one-cup brethren.

More Poetry

Louis C. Medcalf sent us the following from his creative mind. It bears study as well as reading.

Once upon ago I fell from grace of mirror
seeking other's please and cares,
wandered weak and leery there in terror
making other's looks my own snares.
My hung head
my ignorant wear
Time and time ago I felt to look up higher,
stumbled onward tripped on eyes
of my own not yet turned, like others, to fire—
I would not look behind sighs
My flung fled,
dead beneath my lies.
Song, a song, a-going thru my brow,
the dust cleaned from my flinching mirror,
a halo on my now,
my chin sees much clearer
My sung said,
my much, nearer.

Unity Meetings

Two unity efforts of substantial quality are scheduled within the next few months. Those living near the locations of these meetings would do well to make their plans to attend, for one is never quite the same after such an experience.

The first one is to be in Indianapolis, April 29-May 1, and will be held in the Farmers' Building of the Indiana State Fairgrounds. Speakers will represent the three major wings of our people. John R. Lee is the coordinator and participants include John Clark, Jimmy Tuten, Harold Key, David Bobo, Keith Watkins, and Dale Crain.

The other is the Sixth Annual Unity Forum, scheduled for July 1-3 at Atlanta Christian College. While all the speakers are not confirmed, we can announce for sure that three important leaders of current unity efforts will be on the program: J. Ervin Waters, Carl Ketcherside, and Charles Holt. Families can take rooms at the college. Contact Denver Sizemore, 2587 Woodhill Ln., East Point, Ga. or call him at 404-344-2043.

BOOK NOTES

Thoughts on Unity is a volume of special interest to our readers, for it is a compilation of some of the best stuff that has been written on the subject in recent years. Nineteen men from all our major wings have made contributions, and Stan Paregien, the editor, has included a picture of each. Such names as Jimmy Allen, Perry Gresham, Ronald Osborn, Carl Ketcherside, Gene Shelburne, Robert Shaw, and Thomas Langford grace the list. Unity is discussed from virtually every possible point of view. It is a book of the hour, growing out of the existential moment, whatever that means. You'll want your own copy at only 3.95.

The Acts of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ Today is a 72-page booklet by some of our folk who have had unusual experiences in the Holy Spirit. There are 14 different testimonies from men representing various walks of life. including business, medicine, and education. Each tells of his "solid background in the Church of Christ," as one of them puts it, the difficulties through which he passed in search for a meaningful religion, and his eventual victory in the Holy Spirit. Most of them tell of their experience in speaking in tongues, and in some cases there is a minute description given of how the experience came upon them. In reading these accounts I was reminded of the testimonials in William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience,* where one will find almost unbelievable testimonies from some of the world's greatest religious leaders, including prophets and mystics. These brethren of ours can compete with the greatest of them when it comes to unusual experiences. I know most of these brethren personally and can testify to their sincerity and their desire to know Jesus intimately. The booklet is only 1.00 and is published by the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International.

Our readers would do well to become acquainted with the writings of Francis A. Schaffer, who is attracting considerable attention these days among our youth for his forthright and relevant approach to the problems of our time. It was my pleasure to hear him recently in Dallas, at which time an overflow audience of graduate students gave him a standing ovation. He is God-centered in his philosophy and scripturally-oriented in his approach. *The God Who Is There* is especially appropriate for those disturbed by philosophical problems and thought problems in general. It is 2.50 in paperback. *Escape from Reason* is a penetrating analysis of modern thought. It is only 1.00. *The Church*